LABOUR MONTHLY

EDITOR R. PALME DUTT

NOTES OF THE MONTH R.P.D.

THE LABOUR TRIUMPH OF 1945 Joseph Reeves, M.P.

MUNICIPAL ELECTION PROSPECTS—IN BIRMINGHAM Fred Longden, M.P.

NUCLEAR ENERGY AND THE FUTURE

THE T.U.C. AND THE GOVERNMENT J. R. Campbell

WHITHER TORYISM? R. Page Arnot

DOCUMENT OF THE MONTH

BOOK REVIEWS

FROM WAR TO PEACE

6D

SEPTEMBER 1945

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No. XXVII. No. 9

CONTENTS

September, 1945

Page

Notes of the Month—*From War to Peace* by R. P. D. 257

The Labour Triumph of 1945 by JOSEPH REEVES, M.P. 268

Municipal Election Prospects—in Birmingham by FRED LONGDEN, M.P. 270

Nuclear Energy and the Future 272

The T.U.C. and the Government by J. R. CAMPBELL 274

Whither Toryism ? by R. PAGE ARNOT 278

Document of the Month—The Tripartite Conference of Berlin 280

Book Reviews—

A Marxist Looks at the Civil Service by L. W. 287

The Rebirth of France by CLEMENS DUTT 288

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: United Kingdom, 12 months 7s. Postage paid. Abroad, 8s., from LABOUR MONTHLY, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
A stencilled Discussion Guide to the magazine is available to readers at 3s. a year inclusive of postage.

BOUND VOLUMES

Enquiries often come to the office for the older volumes of the LABOUR MONTHLY Of the years set forth below, there are a few copies still available at the prices mentioned :—

	each				each		
1922 (Part II)	£3	3	0	1929	£1	10	0
1923 (Part I)	£3	3	0	1931	£1	5	0
1923 (Part II)	£3	3	0	1932	£1	5	0
1925 —	£2	2	0	1934	£1	1	0
1926 —	£1	15	0	1935	£1	1	0
1927 —	£1	10	0	1937	£1	1	0
1928 —	£1	10	0	1939	£1	1	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES OF THE MONTH

New Beginnings

GREAT events and great changes are shaping the world anew. The war has ended in the Far East, where it began fourteen years ago. These fourteen years have been the heaviest ordeal humanity has known, in which the bankruptcy of the old dying social order, erupting in the black barbarity of fascism, endangered the whole future. But this ordeal, which exposed all the poison and filth of the old society, has also called forth all the heroism and sacrifice and invincible strength of the new rising forces which will shape the future. It has ended in a triumph for the peoples over reaction on a scale which, although the battle is not yet finally ended and the victory so far won has still to be completed and made secure, is already decisive for the future of social development.

From the Old to the New

The end of the war in the Far East has followed closely on the electoral defeat of Toryism in Britain, the formation of the first Labour Government with a parliamentary majority, and the establishment of new democratic governments in Europe. We are entering into new conditions; the old landmarks are passing; the great popular forces liberated by victory over fascism are pressing to the forefront. We cannot yet measure the full shape of the new world that is arising from the still smouldering ashes of battle and destruction. But the speed of events, and the magnitude of the new problems and opportunities arising, makes imperative an attempt to survey briefly some of the factors of the new world situation, no less than of the situation in Britain.

I. From War to Peace—Victory in the Far East

Japan's Surrender

Victory in the Far East came sooner and more suddenly than any preceding plans and calculations of the Allied Command had anticipated. By this quick capitulation, before final defeat, the Japanese war lords evidently hope to preserve their main forces intact. In order to conceal the bankruptcy of all their policies, their propaganda now seeks to attribute their defeat solely to the atomic bomb. The record disposes of this myth of Japanese propaganda. The confession of their bankruptcy and admission of defeat was already established weeks earlier, before any atomic bomb had been dropped, but after the impending entry of the Soviet Union was already fixed with a predetermined date, when the Japanese Government sued for peace and appealed to the Soviet Union to mediate. The governing causes of this bankruptcy were the collapse of Germany in Europe and the resulting isolation of Japan; the overmastering pressure of Anglo-American sea and air power; and the final checkmate through the Soviet Union entry into the war, already agreed at Teheran with a date fixed at three months after the Nazi capitulation. The atomic bomb, whose use was only decided at the last moment at Potsdam, in reversal of the previous decision of President Roosevelt against its use, and which was evidently fixed with foreknowledge for a date two days preceding the Soviet entry, rather precipitated than caused the final collapse.

Causes of Japan's Defeat

Mr. Churchill, in his speech in the House of Commons on August 17, declared:—

> It is to this atomic bomb more than to any other factor that we may ascribe the sudden and speedy ending of the war against Japan.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This repeats the familiar line of Japanese militarist propaganda. A more balanced judgment will rather agree with the analysis of *The Times* editorial on August 16:—

Already the governing classes, headed by the Emperor, are desperately striving to "save their face" by ascribing defeat to the atomic bomb. Conveniently forgetting their request to Russia to mediate with the Allies before the atomic bomb was used, they now assert that but for this device the "sacred war" would still be pursuing its course. This particular manoeuvre will fail as the Japanese people come to realise that their armed forces were thoroughly beaten, not by any single weapon, but by the massed resources of nations whose sense of justice had been outraged by Japan's own behaviour.

As a correspondent in the same issue of *The Times* noted:—

The assertion that new American bombs have brought the Japanese war to a magic end is a myth. As we know, weeks before the appearance of the atomic bombs, the Emperor Hirohito had already asked Stalin to mediate; thus openly admitting defeat. In reality, Japan has been brought down by the interruption of her sea communications by Anglo-American air and sea power, and a danger of a Soviet thrust across Manchuria, cutting the Japanese armies in Asia from home.

Strategy and Illusions

Similarly *The Observer* noted on August 12:—

It is fairly clear that the knowledge of the Soviet Government's intention to enter the war stopped the Japanese Government from contemplating surrender on the Japanese islands, where they were faced by the consequences of the atomic bomb, while continuing resistance in China, Malaya, Korea, Manchuria, and on some Pacific islands; it would have been very hard in that case for the Allies to justify the use of atomic bombs against either Shanghai or Singapore, or in Manchuria or Korea.

The atomic bomb is a powerful weapon of destruction, but by no means an all-sufficing strategy for victory. The same illusions which characterised the Seversky-Disney-Harris theory of victory by air bombing (although the reports before the Kilgore Military Committee of the Senate have since revealed that German production in 1944, despite air bombing, was higher than in any preceding year) have been carried to an extreme plane in relation to the overwhelming destructive power of the atomic bomb. They received typical expression in the announcement of Sir William Beveridge in *The Times* on August 14 that "The atomic bomb has almost certainly relegated all other weapons of modern war—tanks, battleships, guns, rifles and trained conscript masses — to the museum." The fallacy of this notion was pointed out by Rear-Admiral Thursfield in a letter to *The Times* on August 18:—

The fallacy lies in the assumption that wars can be won by destruction alone. The appearance of the atomic bomb has immensely enhanced man's powers of destruction, so much so that, as pointed out by General Rowan-Robinson, there are very few war situations in which it can be used at all. It cannot be used against the Japanese armies still in China, if they should prove recalcitrant. . . . Once our troops are in occupation of Japan itself, it cannot even be used as it was on Hiroshima and Nagasaki unless we deliberately leave large tracts of Japan unoccupied—and consequently under no surveillance—as atomic bomb targets; and even so the occupying troops elsewhere in Japan, dealing with a treacherous and entirely untrustworthy people, must be armed with weapons that they can use at close quarters.

The strategic task in war remains "the defeat of an enemy's armed forces." This is important to bear in mind in assessing the sometimes exaggerated claims, often carried to a fantastic point, in relation to the effects of the atomic bomb on strategy and world-power relations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Soviet Participation in the Far East

Soviet participation in the war in the Far East, as agreed at Teheran, is of far-reaching significance, not only for its immediate strategic effect, but for its influence on the whole character of the Far Eastern settlement. It represents a blow to the designs of reactionary isolationist circles to make the Far Eastern settlement an exclusively American or Anglo-American settlement in place of a United Nations settlement. It increases the favourable factors for a greater degree of reflection of the aims of national liberation in the Far Eastern settlement, especially in the case of the Mongolian, Manchurian and Korean peoples. Further, it ends the duality, previously necessitated by strategic considerations, between the alliance of democratic nations in relation to Europe and in relation to the Far East, and makes the world settlement as a whole now a United Nations settlement.

No Japanese Munich

It is of paramount importance that the Japanese militarists shall not be allowed to get away with their barefaced plans to maintain their essential basis of power untouched, in order to be able to prepare to resume their aggression. This is the key question involved in their manoeuvres to divide the allies and secure the maintenance of the Emperor as the focus of their military-imperial system. Their aims have been still openly proclaimed in the first phase after capitulation. Thus the Political Association of Greater Japan, the fascist party created by the big business and military rulers, issued a declaration boasting that "Japan has been able to end the war with a great reserve of power," and proclaiming the aim to proceed to the re-establishment of "Greater Japan." The Home Secretary proclaimed the aim of "the rapid recovery and growth of the empire." In order that enduring peace may be established in the Far East no less than in Europe, it is imperative that the terms of the Potsdam declaration to Japan be fully and strictly enforced. The Potsdam terms will not have been fulfilled until all war criminals, including the Emperor, have met with "stern justice." The urgency of such measures is stressed by the fact that, as the *Spectator* has noted, "the Japanese get out of the war now with a greater reservoir of armed, undefeated troops, a less damaged industrial potential, than any nation except the United States."

For Chinese Democracy

Equally the situation in China is causing acute concern to all democrats and opponents of fascism. A democratic China cannot be built by civil war against the Communists. It is intolerable that the reactionary Kuomintang clique should use armies, which have in the main been inactive against Japan, and arms supplied by the allies for use against Japan, to make war on the popular regime in Yenan which, though blockaded and deprived of arms from the allies, has engaged in action two-thirds of the Japanese troops in China. It is still more intolerable that Chiang should directly invite, not only the Chinese puppet quislings in the service of Japan, but the Japanese generals and fascists to maintain their arms for use against the Chinese popular forces. This is a situation of grave concern to all the allies of the United Nations to assist a united democratic settlement in China.

India and the Far Eastern Settlement

The reference in the King's Speech to "the early realisation of full self-government in India" needs to be actively followed up with practical steps. The freedom of India, as well as of Burma and Ceylon, must be an integral part of the Asiatic peace

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

settlement. Following the electoral defeat of the Churchill-Amery policies, it is no longer possible to excuse inaction behind the reactionary trick which was operated to defeat the Congress-League agreement that led to the Wavell Plan by substituting the deliberately wrecking formula of "Hindu-Moslem parity." Steps are now needed for the restoration of civil liberty and release of political prisoners, formation of provisional representative governments at the centre and in the provinces, and the holding of elections for a constituent assembly on a broad democratic franchise. This is the special responsibility of the people of this country and the Labour majority in Parliament in relation to the Asiatic peace settlement.

II. The Berlin Agreement and the Settlement of Europe

Teheran-Crimea-Berlin

The Berlin Agreement is a landmark equally in the development and consolidation of the United Nations and in the peace settlement of Europe. It is the first major post-war agreement of the three leading Powers of the United Nations. Contrary to the predictions that the alliance of Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union was only a military wartime alliance which would immediately break asunder after the defeat of the common enemy, the Berlin Agreement has demonstrated the further strengthening and unity of the alliance in the post-war period. The progress from Teheran to Crimea to Berlin has revealed the logic of the alliance in the advance of the range of concrete agreement, despite the sharp intervening differences. Each agreement has settled a series of big outstanding questions and carried forward the alliance. Each agreement has been followed by new problems, divergences to be settled, or questions of interpretation—duly magnified and exploited by hostile quarters to suggest a breakdown of co-operation. The practical necessity of settlement of the new problems has in turn compelled new conference and new agreement—but each time carrying forward and extending the ground already won, enlarging the range of explicit and firmly decided common policy, and bringing that policy closer to the democratic anti-fascist aims of the United Nations.

Settlement of Germany

Outstanding achievement of the Berlin Agreement is the immediate short-term settlement of post-war Germany—the most dangerous question and the key question, not only for the destruction of fascism, but for the whole future of Europe and the relations of the Great Powers. A dangerous situation had arisen in the first phase after the armistice owing to the divergence of policy between the British, American and Russian zones. In the Soviet zone the Nazis were sternly dealt with, while democratic political parties and working-class organisation were given scope. In the British and American zones Nazi officials were maintained in power, close economic relations resumed between British and American monopoly interests and their German partners, and democratic anti-fascist expression or working-class organisation was suppressed as "political." On the eve of the Potsdam Conference the preparation of the Hugenberg Plan, at the direct request of the British authorities, for the economic rebuilding of Germany, showed how far this process had gone. The Berlin Agreement has dealt firmly with this situation and established common principles for all the zones. It has speeded up the trial of war criminals and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

strengthened the measures for the elimination of Nazis from leading positions. It has established the rights in all zones for democratic anti-fascist and working-class organisation and expression, and the beginnings of local elective forms for self-government. And it has established an economic programme for destroying the basis of the big German monopoly interests in heavy industry, the foundation of fascism, and "eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified, in particular, by cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements."

German Economy and Europe

Especially important in the Berlin Declaration is the definite agreement on the economic future of Germany. The main keynote of Nazi propaganda after defeat, expressed through all the usual reactionary pro-fascist channels, City and business expression and their echoes in the democratic camp, has been to insist on the importance of rapidly rebuilding the gigantic industrial mechanism of imperialist Germany. This obviously interested demand of the British and American cartel partners of German monopoly capital (it has been noted as a triumph of Anglo-American pinpoint bombing that amid the general devastation the vast headquarters of the German Chemical Trust have been left intact) has been pressed forward with every kind of publicity and argument: in practical guise, as the most efficient method of extracting reparations; in familiar right-wing guise, as an insurance against revolution; and in progressive humanitarian guise, as the best method of restoring devastated Europe through the flow of goods from a powerful industrial Germany at the centre of Europe. In this way the essential economic foundations of Hitler's aims of Pan-Europe have been sold to certain sections of the left as "Western European Unity."

Common Sense on Reparations

The Berlin Agreement has dealt a sledge-hammer blow to these designs for rebuilding German reactionary domination in Europe. In addition to the prohibition of arms production, and the breaking up of the monopolies and cartels, German heavy industry is to be brought down to a level suitable for "Germany's approved post-war peace-time needs." "Production of metals, chemicals, machinery and other items that are directly necessary to a war economy shall be rigidly controlled and restricted to Germany's approved post-war peace-time needs." Plant and productive machinery above this standard is to be removed from Germany and form the main basis of reparations. This is not only a solution of the problem of reparations which replaces the idiocies and hypocrisies of Versailles with plain physical reparation from the plunderers to the plundered. It also ends the problem of the German monopolist industrial octopus spreading its tentacles over Europe, holding back the development of other European countries to maintain them as an agrarian hinterland, and periodically erupting in military aggression to meet its needs of expansion. Instead, it prepares a different path of European economic recovery, with strengthened industrial development of all countries in place of the previous German domination, and a consequent more balanced economy of Europe as a whole, facilitating democratic development. If the Berlin Agreement is firmly carried out, the battle has been won for European democracy.

Howl of Reaction

It is not surprising that the Berlin Agreement has been received with a howl from all the quarters of reaction, monopoly interests, Vatican intriguers and their hangers-on. The *Observer* of August 5 foamed at the mouth, denounced Soviet democracy as indis-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tinguishable from fascism, and congratulated Mr. Bevin on his "advantage to be able to speak frankly to Russia without being suspected of Tory prejudice." The *Sunday Express* announced, in a message supposed to reflect Rome opinion, that "the Potsdam deal is not liked," and that "there is universal fear that the transformation of Germany from an industrial into an agricultural nation will impede the reconstruction of Europe." Even the tepid welcome of *The Times* editorial found that "the Potsdam Plan does not meet every expectation." The New York *Herald-Tribune* found the project "awesome," and Senator Taft denounced "a dangerous experiment." The *Economist*, organ of the City, with a characteristic admixture of reactionary Polish and Vatican sentiments in its recent phase, let drive full tilt, found the plan equivalent to making Germany "an economic slum," threatened Werewolf revival to fight it, and called for a Western European political and economic alliance counterpoised to the Soviet Union:—

> A hostile, resentful and impoverished nation, fifty million strong, even without arms, is a certain source of trouble. . . . . The Potsdam settlement will not last ten years, and when it breaks down there will be nothing but the razor-edge balance of international anarchy between civilisation and the atomic bomb. . . . The Russians' determination to loot Germany. . . . We may not be able to alter what happens in the Russian zone, but we can at least disclaim responsibility for it. And we can follow our own convictions in the West, where what is left of Germany can be given the prospect, in the fullness of time, of achieving liberty, equality and prosperity within a Western Europe that is conscious of its political and economic unity. (*Economist*, August 11, 1945.)

Neither Hitler, nor Schacht, nor Ribbentrop, could have put it better.

B.B.C. Diplomacy

Similarly the B.B.C., whose function might have been thought to be to popularise the Berlin Agreement signed by the British Government, or at any rate to allow the case for it to be put, offered the public a hostile Foreign Review after the news on August 13 by Barbara Ward, who followed a line similar to that of the *Economist*, deplored the treatment of Germany by the Potsdam Powers, and drew a picture of de-industrialisation bringing poverty, disease and a black spot in the centre of Europe, etc. It is evident that the fight for the Berlin Agreement will not be able to count on very ardent support from some official circles, especially in the Foreign Office and State Department, and will therefore have to be the more energetically conducted by democratic opinion.

Mr. Bevin's Speech

One of the most serious aspects of Mr. Bevin's first speech as Foreign Secretary was the attitude to the Berlin Agreement revealed in the criticism of the provisions for the Western frontier of Poland as well as his reference to other issues. In general, no attempt was made to present positively the programme of the Berlin Agreement, that is, of the programme of the United Nations, for the destruction of fascism, for the break-up of German monopoly capitalism, and for the political rights of democratic anti-fascist parties and working-class organisation, in reversal of the previous policy pursued in the British and American zones. These great gains of the democratic anti-fascist movement, which would not have aroused Tory cheers, were passed over in silence. The general line, which aroused Tory cheers, was to deprecate any policy of "revenge" towards Germany, deplore the criminal lawlessness of the resistance movements, mix fascist and anti-fascist regimes in one hat as "totalitarian," and urge the formula of "economic reconstruction" as the "primary aim." While the Berlin Agreement turned its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attack against Franco Spain, and indicated positive steps towards the conclusion of peace treaties with recognised Democratic Governments in Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary. Mr. Bevin's speech emphasised the policy of non-intervention in relation to Franco Spain, endorsed the Churchill policy in Greece and the Vulgaris Government, and turned the attack on the democratic anti-fascist Governments in Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary. These declarations have naturally been seized upon by Mr. Eden and the Tory press with indecent glee, while they have caused disquiet among Labour supporters.

Labour and Europe

A great opportunity opens out before the labour movement and the Labour Government in relation to Europe and the promotion of democratic development and international democratic co-operation. The response to Mr. Attlee's first letter to the Regent in Greece has illustrated this. The Labour victory over Toryism at the elections, which reflected mass dissatisfaction with the reactionary Tory foreign policy associated with Munichism and pro-fascism and the return of the Labour Government in the key ruling centre of London, have given an enormous stimulus to the democratic anti-fascist forces of Europe and the world. It would be undesirable that this great gain should be dissipated by the creation of an impression that British foreign policy will continue to reflect the traditional outlook of the Foreign Office, viewing with a favourable eye the shortcomings of Governments based on "respectable" upper class quisling elements which suppress the anti-fascist fighters, while hostile to the new Governments based on the democratic anti-fascist movements which deal sternly with the fascists and collaborators. Such an approach does not correspond to the outlook of the labour movement and democratic opinion in this country which won the victory at the elections. It will be for the labour movement and the labour majority in Parliament to see that any such impression is corrected, and to hold policy firmly to the lines of the Berlin Agreement and the anti-fascist programme of the United Nations.

Mr. Laski and the Western Bloc

A similar reflection of one of the traditional aims of Foreign Office policy in the recent period has found expression in the campaign conducted by Mr. Laski and the Labour Party delegation to the French, Danish and Norwegian Socialist Congresses to promote the familiar objective, constantly put forward by British reaction and especially sponsored by the arch-reactionary General Smuts, for the formation of a Western European economic and political bloc under British leadership. The sweeping leftward swing throughout Europe has found expression in a powerful drive to working-class unity, carrying forward the already established socialist-communist co-operation towards fusion in a single working-class party. Such fusion has already been agreed in principle in Italy, by the vote of the National Council of the Italian Socialist Party, still to be agreed by the Congress, and in Norway, where the proposal is due to come before a joint congress at the beginning of September. The campaign of the Labour Party delegation has been directed to arrest this process of closer unity and fusion into a united working-class party. The defeat of the proposal for fusion at the French Socialist Congress was hailed by the *Daily Herald* as evidence that "British Labour's triumph has had a deep influence." The Labour delegation's campaign has been further directed to promote the aim of the Western European bloc, through the mechanism of the Socialist Parties.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Division or Unity

This proposal for a Western European bloc is often put forward as a proposal for "European unity." In reality it is a proposal for the bisection of Europe into two halves, the effect of which can only serve the interests of reactionary German revival. In place of the real unity of democratic anti-fascist Europe, whose essential pillars are the British-Soviet Pact and the Franco-Soviet Pact, it proposes a division into two halves which would enable German reaction once again, as in the inter-war period, to play on the counterposing balance of the two halves in order to rebuild its strength; while in the proposed combination, put forward as the final aim, of Western and Central Europe, Germany would be the strongest dominating force. In this way it reproduces the essential aim of Hitler's "New Europe." Such a proposal is not only contrary to the wishes and interests of the European peoples striving for national independence and development within the framework of democratic all-European co-operation. It is also contrary to the vital interests of the British people, which are not confined to Western Europe, but are closely linked with the Soviet Union in promoting the democratic development and co-operation of all Europe and find expression on the world scale in strengthening the ties of Anglo-American-Soviet co-operation in the leadership of the United Nations.

III. The atomic bomb and world power relations

Mumbo Jumbo and Modern Science

The questions of world power relations have been brought to the forefront by the widespread speculations which have been let loose with regard to the effects of the atomic bomb on strategy and future world development. In general, a great part of the flood of comment on this significant scientific and technical development, and on its prospective influence on the future of humanity, has revealed the bankruptcy of current traditional social theory and philosophy in face of the headlong advance of modern science and technique. Alongside a few utopian speculations, the general tone of current press and public comment has been one of alarm, pessimism, gloomy forebodings, fears of human destruction, moralisings on the inadequate spiritual development of mankind, machiavellian calculations of immediate power advantage, or solemn warnings. The universal paralysing sense, within capitalist society, of lack of social control of the productive forces has never been more powerfully demonstrated.

Short Term Considerations

It is clear that there are short term and long term considerations involved in relation to the new development. The short term considerations turn on the only realised form of the new power which at present exists—the atomic bomb. The long term considerations turn on the prospective future development of the productive use of atomic energy as a new source of power, and its social consequences. Reactionary propaganda endeavours to seize on both aspects for its own advantage. On the one hand, it endeavours to seize on the immediate strategic significance of the atomic bomb, and of the American monopoly of its production to revive the theory of Anglo-American world domination, proclaim triumphantly the possession of a decisive weapon against the Soviet Union, and undermine the basis of Three Power collaboration in the name of the supposed new relation of forces. On the other hand, it endeavours to utilise the future prospective use in production as a justification to proclaim all old sources of energy as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obsolete, and on this basis to decry all proposals for the nationalisation of coal and electricity as out of date and meaningless. Both lines of argument throw more light on the outlook of their exponents than on the real situation.

The World Strategists

The premature strategic calculations of the supposed reversal of world relations of power through the American monopoly of the atomic bomb certainly reveal the wishful thinking of reactionary propagandists. "So long as we and the United States have the monopoly of this discovery," proclaims the blissful *Daily Mail*, "the difference in war potential between us and the rest of the world is as if they had not discovered electric or steam power." "It means a great change in world power relations," declares the *Observer*, "it binds Britain and America together as never before. . . . it shifts the balance of power among the Big Three . . . the possession of the monopoly of the atomic bomb makes American-British power predominance, for the time being, a fact." Mr. Churchill in the House of Commons on August 16 found himself "in entire agreement with the President that the secrets of the atomic bomb should so far as possible not be imparted at the present time to any other country in the world. . . . For this and many other reasons the United States stood at this moment at the summit of the world. He rejoiced that this should be so."

Cautionary Considerations

Before accepting these simple conclusions entirely at face value, it will be well to bear in mind a few cautionary considerations. In the first place, as we have earlier had occasion to note, the over-simplification of strategy implicit in these assumptions will not bear examination even in the strategic field alone. In the second place, these declarations are made without knowledge of the stage Soviet science has reached in this field; and it has happened more than once before now that reactionary hotheads who have based their confident calculations on the supposed backwardness of Soviet science and technique have had their fingers burned. In the third place, the supposed Anglo-American monopoly is not borne out by the facts; in this respect, Mr. Churchill has correctly referred to an American monopoly:—

> The United States is the only country which knows all the details of the atom bomb. (*Daily Herald*, August 14.)

> There emerges one fact that is seriously exercising the minds of engineers in this country. It is that no practical experience or data of its manufacture exists in Britain. (*Sunday Times*, August 12.)

From this last point certain important conclusions follow.

Political Conclusions

If this last point may be taken as a correct description of the facts, it follows that the boasted "American-British power predominance" on the basis of the atomic bomb is a myth, and that the position of Britain would be closer in practice to the supposed position attributed by these theorists to the Soviet Union. More than this. The available evidence indicates that, while the general theoretical development underlying the new discovery has gone forward in all advanced countries, the actual process of production requires at present the devotion of enormous resources, as suggested in the declared expenditure of £500 million on its production by the United States. Such an outlay can only be within the reach of the largest, most highly developed industrial States, such as the United States and the Soviet Union. How far is it within the reach of present-day Britain? On the other hand, it is precisely a small densely crowded country such as

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, or Japan, that is most vulnerable to the atomic bomb, as against the vast and virtually unconquerable spaces of the United States or the Soviet Union. Is it not obvious that the supposed partnership of "American-British power predominance" would turn into the uttermost helpless dependence of this country on the United States, and that the interest of this country lies now more than ever in maintaining the basis of Three Power collaboration and pressing for the international control of the new weapon in the hands of the leadership of the United Nations? The main world political alignment not only retains its validity, but increases its validity in the conditions of the new weapon.

Long Term Aspects

But it is the long term considerations which are of profound interest for the future and carry the most pregnant immediate social lessons. The old Wilhelm Liebknecht relates in his *Biographical Memoirs of Karl Marx* how Marx in 1850 responded to the portent of electric power:—

Marx ridiculed the victorious reaction in Europe that fancies it had smothered the revolution and did not suspect that Natural Science was preparing a new revolution. That King Steam, who had revolutionised the world in the last century, had ceased to rule, and that into his place a far greater revolutionist would step, the electric spark.

And now Marx, all flushed and excited, told me that during the last few days the model of an electric engine drawing a railroad train was on exhibition in Regent Street. "Now the problem is solved—the consequences are indefinable. In the wake of the economic revolution the political must necessarily follow, for the latter is only the expression of the former. . . ."

That evening I did not get home—we talked and laughed and drank till late the next morning, and the sun was already up when I went to bed. And I did not stay in bed long. I could not sleep. My head was too full of everything I had heard; the thoughts, surging to and fro, drove me out again, and I hastened to Regent Street in order to see the model, this modern Trojan horse that civilised society, like the Trojan men and women of old, was leading jubilantly into its Ilios in suicidal blindness and that would surely bring on its destruction.

What would Marx and Wilhelm Liebknecht have felt and thought in face of the prospect of the discovery of the means to harness atomic energy?

Towards Socialism and Communism

Whatever the time required for the further development of the new discovery to its practical use in production, it is obvious to-day to the dullest that this development must revolutionise all social conditions. The potential release of limitless power not only opens the way to completing man's mastery of the conditions of his existence, but thereby opens the way to providing such abundance as can ensure the material foundation, not merely for socialism and the ending of poverty, but for the completed stage of communism or unrationed abundance. But it is no less obvious that the indispensable key to realising these possibilities, the vast resources needed for its production, no less than the necessity of control of such a gigantic source of power, all alike imperatively require social ownership. Never has the truth of the Marxist principle been more powerfully demonstrated that with every technical advance the titanic growth of the productive forces becomes more and more manifestly incompatible with the maintenance of the conditions of private ownership. The question is not whether the new power shall be morally or immorally used, as the great part of current comment sagely suggests, but whether it shall be privately or socially owned. The most hard-bitten advocate of private enterprise finds himself faced with the compulsion to recognise the necessity

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of social ownership of such a decisive power. But this means that, assuming full development (in practice, it is doubtful whether full development is possible save within a society based on social ownership) the decisive source of power in modern society, to which all other forms are subordinate, becomes socially owned, thus governing the general character of the society in question. Thus the new scientific and technical developments powerfully reinforce every lesson of the present period for the necessity of socialism and for hastening the advance to socialism.

IV. The Labour Government's Programme

The King's Speech

It is in this complex and dynamic new world of sweeping changes, unfamiliar problems and uncharted possibilities, growing out of the conditions of the war, but already advancing to a different shape, and with post-war Britain most acutely involved in every current problem, that the Labour Government enters on its term of office and puts forward its programme. The programme of the Labour Government, as set out in the King's Speech, has won a universal welcome from all sections of the working-class movement and from the broadest sections of democratic opinion. The King's Speech has embodied the main election premises of "Let Us Face the Future" in a bold and comprehensive programme. There will be full and enthusiastic support for the fulfilment of the measures set out in this programme. But there is no room for minimising the obstacles in the path even of such a moderate programme of democratic and social reform. The real test begins in action.

No Easy Road

There can be no under-estimating the grave character of the problems now arising. The sudden end of the war, precipitated in advance of previous anticipations and plans, has intensified and hastened all the problems of the transition from war to peace. These are difficult for all countries, but in certain respects especially for Britain. The international economic position of Britain is characterised by special difficulties, which are sharply brought out with the abrupt ending of lease-lend. The speeding up of demobilisation, closing down of war contracts and large-scale dismissal of war workers raise at once all the questions of the change-over in industry. The weaknesses of organisation of the basic industries, of coal, steel and textiles and of the peacetime consumption industries which require to be expanded, are now sharply brought to the front. Since the wartime expansion of engineering comes to an end, while the most characteristic peacetime consumption industries which require to be expanded, such as textiles, clothing and distribution, are low wage industries, the end of the war is bringing or threatening to millions of workers a cut in earnings; and the employers are not loth to see the burden of such an unpopular change thrown on the Labour Government. Only a comprehensive national plan for the conversion of industry, the adaptation of factories, the placing of new orders, and the rapid raising of the level of wages, while maintaining effective control of prices and supplies, can help to meet this situation. It is not only a schedule of legislation, but decisive action and leadership in the sphere of production and economy that is now above all essential; and it is on this basis that wide masses will be testing the Labour Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Working Class Unity

It will be necessary to return in more detail to these problems of the British post-war situation, some of which are examined in the article of J. R. Campbell in the current issue. But one immediate conclusion is clear. The unity and close co-operation of all sections of the working-class movement will be more than ever essential in the period now opening, equally to rally mass support in the decisive sphere of production, as also in the political sphere. A special responsibility will fall on the trade unions, on the shop stewards and organisation of the workers in the factories, and on the Marxist political leadership within the working-class movement, which finds its organised expression in the Communist Party. We are entering into conditions which will test the capacity of leadership of every section of the labour movement, and of the strength, solidarity, campaigning power and resolution of the entire movement in order to carry forward the advance of the people which was begun at the elections to decisive victories over the big monopolist interests and political reaction.

R. P. D.

August 21, 1945.

The Labour Triumph of 1945

by JOSEPH REEVES, M.P.

IN November, 1917, a revolution occurred in Russia. The nature of that revolution was such that its effects could not be confined to Russian territory. Like the earlier French revolution, it was to affect, only very much more so, the way of thinking and the way of life of countless millions of people all over the world.

The establishment of the First Workers Socialist Republic was a significant international event, far transcending the French Revolution. History teaches us that no great revolution can be confined to specified territories. Like a certain author has said in another connection, "Ideas have legs" and in the modern world they have wireless and all manner of means of communication.

The social ferment started in that November was to develop at an increasing speed overcoming all obstacles of language, racial and religious divisions and artificial frontiers. The common man was on the march. Henry Wallace has said on many occasions that "we are entering into an age of the common man." That was a rather inexact way of saying that the world proletariat was becoming class-conscious.

In vast areas like China and India, the effect of the Russian Revolution can be seen in one hundred different ways and in spite of the temporary triumph of fascism and Nazism, the continent of Europe tells the same story. Within the British Commonwealth, in New Zealand, Australia and Canada, the same process can be seen activating the political life of these three interesting countries.

But what of Great Britain, the traditional home of democracy, the country which boasts of a universal franchise but which couples with it a House of Lords and a monarchy, which has put Tory majorities in the Commons for eighteen years out of twenty and even when there were two short spells of Labour administration, no independent majority was accorded to Labour. For ten years, this country, with its island insularity, has had no general election. Who could tell what was happening in the minds of the great

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mass of the people? Millions of voters had never voted at a general election, because they had been under age in 1935.

How had the Russian Revolution affected these people? We knew that very large audiences could be obtained when Russian films were exhibited and when Anglo-Soviet meetings and exhibitions were organised. We knew that in the workshops and the factories the workers championed the cause of the Soviet Union and rebutted anti-soviet propaganda.

But in spite of all this, did we expect the great Labour triumph of July, 1945? Did we think that the mass of the people would have been impervious to the powerful influence of Winston Churchill as war leader and chairman of the Conservative Party? Had not history taught us that at the end of great wars, when a nation emerges victorious, the people patriotically support the war leadership during the subsequent years? But on this occasion, new ideas had entered into the minds of the electors. When in days gone by they had heard of the possibilities of Socialism, they were sceptical, because of its theoretical and untried nature. They did not like leaping into the economic unknown. They were cautious and conservative, but during this election it was a different story. In my election speeches, I said that Socialism was no longer a dream. It was a living reality. Its power and potency had been demonstrated by the Soviet Union both in peace and in war for all men to see who had the power of sight. Whilst Capitalism had led to fascism, Nazism and Munich, Socialism had led to a measure of human achievement beyond the wildest dreams of the Utopians.

I have witnessed the growth of our great Labour movement. I can well remember the exaltation of spirit experienced when Victor Grayson was returned for Colne Valley and Pete Curran for Jarrow. I have witnessed the increasing Labour representation in Parliament. The process has been tortuously slow. We have made our advances and then we have had our set-backs, but through it all, we have been progressing cumulatively.

But the great stride has come during the last decade. The profound understanding of their role in human society and their mission in the world has come, not only to the working man and woman, but to the technician, the professional worker and many civil servants and members of the intelligentsia. This awakening has come because we have a living example of the scientific superiority of a Socialist planned society over the disorderly arrangement of a capitalist era. The opponents of Socialism have been confounded by the uprising of a giant state which has fashioned its life along equalitarian lines.

This seems to me to be the explanation of the great Labour Victory at the General Election. On the whole, the workers were united in a belief that we could advance towards the same goal and they went to it with their eyes fixed on their objective.

Unless I entirely misunderstand the signs of this revolution, there is going to be no turning back. Labour is on the march. If we can achieve real Socialist measures during the next five years, there is no reason at all why we should ever have again a Tory majority in the Mother of Parliaments.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Municipal Election Prospects—in Birmingham

by FRED LONGDEN, M.P.

BIRMINGHAM Labour's Municipal prospects are good; but neither the municipal nor the parliamentary possibilities can be appreciated without a knowledge of the historical and contemporary conditions that are peculiar to this city.

When, at the Blackpool Labour Party Conference, a leader used the phrase "the mystery of Birmingham," he was expressing what large numbers of people felt. Yet there never has been any either "mystery" *or* problem for the student of the past and present of Birmingham. The determining factors are known and can be shown to bear on municipal, even more than on parliamentary affairs.

Briefly, as Marx well forecast, the general trend of industry has been—as it still is—to develop into larger units of ownership and more highly concentrated units of capital control. It is true that Birmingham has such octopus links as the Midland Bank; Nuffields; Austins; G.E.C.; Guest, Keen and Nettlefolds; engineering works and the rest. *Yet Birmingham continues to be the citadel of the "small man."*

You may anticipate the effect of this primary factor on municipal affairs in particular? In that the workers have long been separated in numerous small factories and businesses, trade unionism and "mass psychology" have not been strong, despite the great population of this area. Such a situation is not nearly so favourable as it is in centres of basic and staple industries like coal, cotton, woollen and Dockland. And so the direct effect has been to keep the workers politically divided and backward and *unaware*—a condition of things which has been worsened by traditionally low levels of wages. That is to say, the political has reflected industrial and commercial life.

All this developed peculiar forms of local patriotism and paternalism, since the widespread disunity and separation caused the mass of workers to look for guidance to lordly "superiors" and "self-mades" with capital. Such a situation produced Joe Chamberlain. The farce of "three acres and a cow" gave credence to the old practice of "small," "free," competitive enterprise, in country *and* town. So the compound of local paternalism, patriotism, and benevolence was predominant. It was pressed forward through the influence of the Quaker business leaders, who, striving to be "model employers," whilst setting up such a housing scheme as that in the Bournville of Cadbury's, helped to induce the City Fathers to be municipally progressive. But it must not be forgotten that, throughout the decades here implied, local Socialists and trade union officials have contributed much fine service in this direction, just as they continue so to do.

Therefore, though the city has been under Tory rule so consistently and persistently—because of the given determinants—it might be claimed that no other British town can boast of so much "municipal socialism" as can Birmingham. In Joe's time much central slum property was bought up by the Corporation and made into fairly good thoroughfares and shopping-centres, with benefit to the Corporation. Municipal gas, electricity, water, tram, bus and refuse-salvage-*use*, in normal times, have been profitable and examples in service for all to see, while the very successful municipal bank was the first of its kind in Britain. In matters of house-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

building, hospitals, infirmary and such places of institutional care for the old and young, sick and weak, with a no mean record educationally, Birmingham Tory paternalism has considerable room to boast.

So is explained why prominent Labour leaders never attracted large audiences in this city. What they advocated, as great municipal *aims* of "socialism," enjoyed much practice in Birmingham! Morrison and Greenwood must have *felt* this atmosphere when they came to speak. For the meetings were very dull and uninspiring, more often than not. All Greenwood could say, when reflecting on the municipal accomplishments of Birmingham's Tories, was that the "services are in the wrong hands!"

The coming municipal elections, then, will not be freed from these particular and peculiar local circumstances. That we have won ten of the thirteen parliamentary seats is no absolutely reliable index. That selfsame, ingrown, dependence on City Fathers of one party has but moved towards hope from Political Fathers of another Party, to an extent hardly known elsewhere. Fear of a return of the miseries of the inter-war years, experiences and like feelings of men and women in the Forces, and the common "feeling" that peace and production and social security are more likely to bear fruit in Labour's hands, are factors which have given Labour "a chance." And so deep these feelings have been that even Churchill could not control them and our candidates received the benefit of them irrespective of individual capacity.

If this tension continues and we keep in touch with the residents of Birmingham, we may win a majority on the City Council. At present, Labour and Co-operative hold but 22 of the 136 seats. Since Aldermen are in the proportion of 1 to 3 Councillors, we have 8 and the Tories 34. If we gain "power," of course, this 34 will have to be reduced considerably. One half of them "retire"—nominally so, unless this change came about—every six years.

In November, Labour will have only 8 seats to defend, and expects to fight all the 54 that will face the election. If we capture only two-thirds, the Tories will hold 20 above parity, although many are of the opinion that we may sweep most of the board. In any case, even the Tories anticipate serious losses in their ranks.

There is no "mystery"—only a set of peculiar circumstances. In face of the inherent contradictions and accumulating troubles of pre-war capitalism, our City Fathers could make little or no headway. Relatively speaking, their "progress" was retrogressive. The Labour group worked hard and well, winning the favour of many citizens. So that, all in all, if the Tories are not actually feared, they are looked upon as a failure during recent decades, and the cry for succour has turned leftwards. And Labour may rule in Birmingham in November next. Then competence and boldness must be demonstrated very quickly, as in Parliament, *now*, for the people are not only hopeful: *they are "expecting."* Otherwise . . .? What an epoch-making opportunity we have!

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nuclear Energy and the Future

(These views of a physicist, who must remain anonymous, will be of special interest to our readers.—Ed. L.M.)

THE technical basis of the atomic bomb and the history of the academic investigations in nuclear physics which led to its development, have been the subject of publications by the Governments of U.S.A. and of the United Kingdom.* The fundamental contributions made by British scientists, especially those associated with Rutherford and Chadwick in the Cavendish Laboratory, and with their great Danish colleague, Professor Niels Bohr, are now well known. It is clear that it was only the limitations imposed on the economy of a country which fought with its back to the wall which prevented Britain from being the first to possess the new weapon. British participation in the tremendous American effort, though confined to scientific and technical help, has not been negligible. Though a very junior partner in the great enterprise, Britain should be able to influence profoundly the way in which the new power is controlled and utilised for the benefit of mankind, because her scientists possess a deep knowledge of the technical basis, and because this country stands as an intermediary between Europe and the Western World.

I propose to set out here some personal views about how Britain can help to prevent any future use of the weapon for war, of how it might be made the greatest single factor in securing world peace, and of the practical benefits which the development of nuclear energy might bestow on mankind.

Physical science is a peculiarly international knowledge. Complete access to all the fundamental facts of the method of releasing nuclear energy is possessed by every country in which physical scientists are active. No scientist is under the illusion that it is practicable to confine the ability to make the weapon to any one country or group of countries. The present methods of utilising nuclear energy are but the first of the practical results which will follow from increasing scientific knowledge of matter.

It is by no means certain, and indeed it is very improbable, that the existing methods are the best which can be devised. The complexity and astronomical cost of the equipment erected in America arose largely from the fact that time alone mattered. The importance of getting an early answer at all costs overweighed every other consideration. It is certain that the experience gained in building and operation, when incorporated into new plant, could reduce the cost and size by a large factor. The realisation of alternative methods will simplify the process still further. Other countries approaching the problem afresh and without preconceived ideas of existing plant, might easily make the weapon by a far less laborious process.

It is obvious that any attempt to "corner" nuclear power is bound to fail. Indeed, such action will lead to a very grave state of affairs in the world which could have disastrous consequences for our civilisation. The only alternative is some sort of international control. Such control can be effective only if it is voluntarily imposed from within. Inspection by a world authority could not permanently prevent manufacture of weapons by a determined industrial country. The subject is too new for every possible avenue of approach to be plugged by initial agreement.

* *Statements relating to the Atomic Bomb.* Treasury Paper, H.M.S.O. price 4d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International discussion of the atomic bomb and its controls involves none of the grave political questions which surround almost every other topic of international importance. A body of politicians, scientific men and military tacticians, discussing the purely technical implications of the new power, is a very different matter from a discussion of such questions as trade, exchange, frontiers, and so on, all of which involve the peculiarities of national psychology. It is because the new weapon is so grave a menace to mankind and because it is amenable to purely technical discussion, that it may be instrumental in initiating a new basis for international agreement. It is a problem requiring very wide and open discussion in every country if grave dangers are to be avoided for the future. In particular every element of secrecy must be eliminated from all considerations of nuclear energy. The peculiar intermediate position of Britain renders her the natural initiator of such important discussions. The compact nature of the United Kingdom renders these islands more vulnerable than any other great nation if the weapon is ever used in future warfare.

Unfortunately, the atomic bomb is inseparable from the industrial use of nuclear energy. It will be clear from the published accounts that the same materials are needed for both applications. The two aspects are inseparable. It is unlikely that nuclear energy can replace other sources of power in the near future, but it is inevitable that the new method for producing power will gradually become of economic importance. If this country is to continue to exert a major influence on development and control of nuclear power in all its forms it must be prepared to make large contributions in scientific and technical effort.

During the war we have relied to a large extent on the great productive capacity of the United States and indeed the development of the atomic bomb for this war, would have been impossible without access to her tremendous natural resources and to the initiative and drive of the American nation. We cannot hope to go on living on charity. We must make our effort and contribute all that we can to the development of the peacetime uses of the new power if we are to share fully in the benefits it can provide for mankind. Industrial rights in the new sphere must be controlled internationally for a long time to come, and such control can be effective only if it is continually brought into line with scientific advance by utilising fully all relevant technical information and by keeping it above ordinary political considerations.

It is not impossible that the new explosive itself may be of great value in other than the warlike spheres of human activity. It might be practicable to create lakes and storage basins, or even mountains by its use, thus making possible changes in the climate and agricultural economy of otherwise completely useless regions of the earth. We are able at present to set free only about one-thousandth of the energy locked up in matter, so that there is room for tremendous advance.

We can look forward to a new era in human relationship as a result of this revolution in our methods of creating energy. Properly and openly developed it can lead to increased prosperity for us, and to the effective deliverance from a subsistence economy of the great bulk of the human race. With corresponding advance in other branches of science and medicine it can do much to achieve the decent life which is the aim of all mankind. If the governments and peoples of the world fail to reach proper agreement about its control and use we can look forward with certainty to the most terrible tragedy of human history.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The T.U.C. and the Government

by J. R. CAMPBELL

THIS year's Trades Union Congress will meet at Blackpool at a moment when the Labour Government is getting down to business, when the switch over from war to peace is beginning to gather momentum, when the Japanese war has ended sooner than anyone expected.

The switch over to peace conditions will take place in somewhat different circumstances than was envisaged either by the Coalition Government, the employers or the organised trade union movement. All of them, in their various ways, had expected the Japanese war to last well into next year and so enable the Government to carry out a gradual transition from war to peace. Clearly the switch over will take place quicker than the Government has allowed for, and exceptional efforts will have to be made to prevent mass unemployment, of a short-term character, appearing in a number of areas.

The Coalition Government based its policy on the assumption that any unemployment in the immediate post-war period would be of a frictional character, i.e., workers temporarily unemployed while their factories were being re-tooled for peace-time work, workers released from war industry or from the forces in search of a decent peace-time job and not prepared to take the first situation which was offered them. This period of frictional unemployment, it was expected, would give way to a trade boom which would last for several years. The coming of peace would release a vast pent-up demand for consumer goods, for vast schemes of capital re-equipment, which, together with the housing programme, should keep industry fully employed in the immediate post-war years.

All this is possible upon one assumption, namely, that the necessary amount of foreign raw materials which are used by our industries will be forthcoming on credit, for clearly some time must elapse before we are able to build up our export trade and pay for all the raw material and food we find it necessary to import.

Normally there would be no difficulty in this. Britain is one of the safest markets for the producers of food and industrial raw materials and they would not boggle at extending credit facilities. But, alas, they have been extending credit facilities all during the war and a debt of between £3,500 million and £4,000 million is now owing to them. Some of the producers concerned may be unable, or reluctant to, give further credit, especially when they know that the existing debt can only gradually be repaid. (Britain will have to build up sufficient exports to pay for its current imports before it can begin to repay these debts in a big way.)

The bulk of the debt appears to be owing to Indian producers, after them come the producers of Egypt, Canada, Australia and Eire. Then countries like New Zealand, South Africa, Portugal, Argentina and the Middle Eastern countries. Some of those countries, notably the Dominions, will be prepared to grant further credits, but for some time the raw material question will be amongst the Government's greatest headaches.

The position would be eased if the U.S. was to make substantial final gifts under lend-lease, or if it was to make a loan (outside the credit facilities provided by the Bretton Woods agreement) to enable Britain to tide over its raw material difficulties. The snag appears to be that the United States administration appears to desire

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a too speedy return to multilateral trade. It frowns not only on discriminatory trade agreements between countries, but on long term bulk purchase agreements and on State regulated trade in general. It may want the most precise assurances that, as a condition for granting a loan, these practices should be abandoned. This assurance a British government is not likely to give in the sweeping form in which it is usually demanded.

This question will be faced when the Congress discusses the report of its Economic Committee on the regulation of international trade. The report will stress the need for a planned development of British foreign trade and for improvements in the efficiency of Britain's export industries. In order to avoid a new outbreak of economic warfare, the report will strongly advocate the need for international agreements between the Governments.

A closely related question is the future of prices. The T.U.C. has declared for the retention of rationing and price control after the war, and would increase rations as more supplies become available. As the prices of most of the rationed foods are subsidised, this would involve some increase in the subsidy. If foreign prices move upwards a further increase may be necessary. The Trades Union Congress General Council met Sir John Anderson on this question after his notorious 1944 Budget speech and stressed the danger of inflation if the cost of living were not maintained at the level which existed at that time.

In reply, Sir John Anderson made three distinct points:—

(1) If wage rates were forced up it would be impossible to continue the price stabilisation policy.

(2) The Government was more than anxious that prices should be kept about their existing levels.

(3) That the use of subsidies without restraint would lead to an abnormal gap between domestic and world prices.

Now these propositions are very difficult to reconcile with the actual policy pursued by the Coalition Government.

For example, the Government allowed the price of consumer goods in general (as distinct from the limited series which form the basis of the cost of living index) to rise. While the cost of living was around 30 per cent. above pre-war, the prices of all consumer goods were more than fifty per cent. over pre-war. Naturally the worker estimates the purchasing power of his wages in relation to all consumer goods and not merely those relating to the increased cost of living. The Coalition Government was pursuing a two-faced policy when it called upon the workers to keep their wage demands within reason and at the same time permitted the cost of consumers' goods to rise.

A genuine price stabilisation policy must be based on keeping a closer control of all prices. Food prices must be kept low, even if increased subsidies have to be granted, and the price control machinery has to be extended to keep all prices low. There is little doubt that Congress will insist upon this. Of course, the delegates will remember that the ultimate person who pays subsidies is the taxpayer. It is therefore important to ensure that taxation is levied in such a way as to ensure that all the cost of subsidies does not fall on the working-class.

This question will doubtless be keenly debated if the Economic Committee of the General Council is able to complete its report on taxation and fiscal policy in time for presentation to Congress. The report will naturally stress the fact that taxation policy must be a part of a wider policy aiming at a more equitable distribution of wealth, full employment and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the raising of the productivity of British industry. From the narrower standpoint, taxation is related to the level of real wages. A reduction of income-tax levies on the workers would be one of the most immediate means of raising real wages. Post-war taxation is therefore likely to be one of the most disputed questions between the people and the monopolists.

Congress is not likely to agree to the proposition advanced in capitalist circles for an all-round deduction in the standard rate of income-tax. There is no point in handing to the rich taxpayer money to be spent indiscriminately. Taxation reliefs must be adapted to the wide and social economic aims that the labour movement and Government are pursuing.

The 1944 Trades Union Congress passed a resolution calling for a return to pre-war rates of personal allowance in assessing income-tax. This, in our opinion, is the way in which the question has to be approached. Congress would be well advised to ask the Labour Government, in remitting taxation, to raise the income-tax exemption limits and personal allowances, thus relieving the lower-paid workers of all income-tax payments altogether.

With regard to the rich, the gradual abrogation of the Excess Profits Tax, and the increase of allowances in respect of actual capital extensions undertaken by the business firms is all that is necessary or advisable at the present time.

The Transport and General Workers Union has placed a resolution before Congress which enunciates a general wage policy for the movement. It would be useful, in view of the advent of the Labour Government and the approaching problems of the transition if the delegates seized the occasion to have a general discussion on this issue. Congress stands for a policy of price stabilisation, as we have seen. It has, however, always combated the idea that the freezing of wages was a necessary part of a price stabilisation policy.

It did so because it refused to accept the pre-war relationship between wages and profits, to freeze the wages of the lower paid workers, or to admit that wages should be related merely to prices, and not also to the output of the workers.

How right this attitude is can be seen if we consider the wages question in relation to the restarting of civilian industry. Congress has rightly argued that there should be no direction of labour to civilian industries, that at the most a worker who refuses to take a job in those industries should be deprived of his unemployment benefit for the usual statutory period. It takes the view that the civilian industries which are high priority industries should improve their wages and conditions and attract labour. This applies particularly to some civilian industries which are high on the priority list and whose wages levels are scandalously low. In the last Ministry of Labour survey of workers' earnings, for example, the textile group is shown as paying an average of £5 1s. 10d. for men and £2 15s. 7d. for women, while the drink and tobacco group shows £5 6s. for men and £2 13s. 11d. for women. Engineering earnings for the same period were £6 13s. 9d. for men and £4 2s. 5d. for women. The workers returning from war industry to peace-time industry are being asked to accept a catastrophic reduction in their standard of life.

They are also being asked to accept a sharp worsening of their working conditions. "Already the workers transferred to war production five years ago, who are now returning to their peace-time industries, are complaining very bitterly of the lack of amenities in their old factories. They had been ac-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

customed to such conditions until they went into the modern munition plants, where they had good ventilation, good lighting, first-class sanitary accommodation, good canteens, first aid surgeries, rest rooms, etc. . . . Now that they are back to their peace-time industries they object very strongly to the noise, the dirt and the lack of the decencies of life." (*The T.U.C. in Wartime*, April, 1945.) Clearly an improvement in the wages and conditions of these industries is a necessary part of the switch over to peace-time industry.

The Transport and General Workers Union resolution relates the demand for higher wages to the drive for full employment. "The great increase in industrial productivity, unless accompanied by an increase in the purchasing power of the people, will, with all certainty, lead to a repetition of the grim experiences between the years 1918 and 1939," it says.

The resolution asks the unions in all industries to aim at establishing "an adequate minimum weekly wage, irrespective of sex, with appropriate adjustments for the higher skilled grades" and asks "that all wage agreements negotiated between the trade unions and the employers shall be legal minima enforceable by law." Clearly the idea of a "floor under wages" is beginning to catch on among British trade unionists.

Of course, the trade unionists must recognise the fact that they are operating in a controlled economy, which is being steered by a Labour Government. They will have to consider the bearing of any wage policy which they put forward on the entire economic policy that the Government is pursuing. This does not mean that the unions will be prepared without further ado to accept the Government's advice on wage questions. But it does mean that the unions should have full information on the economic policy that the Government is pursuing and that there should be continuous co-operation between the Labour Party and the T.U.C. The cold shouldering of the unions which was such a feature of the first Macdonald government, must not be repeated.

On the other hand, the Government can justly expect the union executives to do everything in their power to persuade members to work through the official machinery. It may be the tactic of certain employers to embarrass the Government by provoking strikes. Don't let us walk into this obvious trap by engaging in unofficial strikes.

"The Labour Government will be judged by its ability to deliver the goods" is a platitude that needs to be amplified. One of the conditions for the Labour Government to be able to deliver the goods is the wholehearted co-operation of those who voted for it. The workers must assist it by their work on the building job, in the pit and the factory. The Labour Government can remove the obstructions to the intensive building of houses that have been created by vested interests, but only the organised activity of the best elements in the unions will ensure that the houses go up without unnecessary delay. If there is any repetition on the new housing jobs of the slow motion tactics which disgraced London's blitz repairs the Labour Government will receive a mortal blow. While much of the delay in London is due to the bad organisation of the employers, it is also well known that a minority of the building workers did not play the game and this scallywag minority was not combated sufficiently by the active trade unionists on the jobs. Sabotage of the Labour Government may come not merely from the class-conscious employers but from the class-unconscious in the ranks of the workers.

A resolution on the agenda from the Electrical Trades Union calls for the continuation of the Joint Production

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Committees in time of peace. Quite a number of problems are raised by this suggestion, but no one can doubt that the activity of production committees in building, mining and transport, would be of the utmost value in the struggle for the strengthening of the new Government. There is no need to wait for nationalisation.

"They have a majority. They have no excuse for failing this time," is a saying now being repeated in every workshop. One can be sure that Congress will fully realise that it has a major part to play in helping Labour to fulfil its programme and implement its promises.

Whither Toryism?

by R. PAGE ARNOT

THE defeat of the Tories at the General Election did not mean their extinction. They muster a minority inside the House of Commons, an overwhelming majority in the House of Lords. Outside parliament they represent formidable forces. The owners of finance-capital are not going to sit back and see themselves dispossessed of their power without trying every means to prevent it. The labour movement after this sweeping electoral victory must now expect new forms of struggle to develop, quite apart from parliamentary opposition or millionaire-press propaganda, and must be on the alert and stay on the alert. This makes it of importance to pay heed to any new trends in Tory policy as a clue to possible later developments.

It is on the field of world politics, where there was no need to throw up a smoke-screen of electoral propaganda, that these new trends would come out most clearly: and in point of fact they have emerged for over four months. While world politics were crystallised in the war of the peace-loving nations against the Axis powers, the dominant Tory policy as put forward by Churchill and Eden was of one kind. Its last important expression was the defence of the Crimea Decisions against Lord Dunglass and other Tory M.P.s supporting the Polish Szlachta in London. So soon as victory was certain, there was an abrupt change, visible in Eden's San Francisco manoeuvres with the attempt to wriggle out of the Crimea decisions on Poland, but particularly menacing in Churchill's victory broadcast of May 13. On that day he spoke with gloom of "police-governments" in Europe. Three weeks later, in his first election broadcast, he uttered his foreboding of a "socialist Gestapo" in Britain.

From the first attempts to shuffle away from the Crimea decisions, up to the Conference of Berlin, took some three months, in which the new tone was amplified in the Tory press, and emphasised by a series of actions (e.g., Dunglass and Co. taken into the "Caretaker Government") on the part of the Tory ministry. It was assumed by many, however, that the meeting at Potsdam would restore harmony. They were to be undeceived.

Mr. Churchill's speech in the Commons on August 15 was calculated to undermine public confidence in the decisions taken at Potsdam with himself as principal participant. By stressing objections to decisions "which are in the nature of compromise" he laid the basis for what could afterwards become a Tory campaign to annul these decisions. By his unmeasured attack on seven of the new anti-fascist governments in Europe, he revealed the Tory hatred

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these new democracies, where the peasants are unclenching the greedy fists of a feudal landed class. Implicit in his picture of "the iron curtain which at the moment divides Europe in twain" lay hostility of tone to the U.S.S.R. underlined (despite a later saving phrase) by his immediately following rhetoric about the Balkan countries in which "almost everywhere Communist forces have obtained, or are in process of obtaining, dictatorial powers."

Never in the past when the semi-fascist military dictatorships raged in the Balkans (Metaxas in Greece, Alexander II or Stoyadinovitch in Yugoslavia) or during the years of Salazar's dictatorship in Portugal did Churchill raise his voice. But now, when the landlords are being forced to yield their land to the peasants and when elementary rights are for the first time given to the workers, the new anti-fascist governments are pursued with invective and slanders.

It was a reckless speech, a trouble-making speech. But amongst the Isolationists (now the most reactionary Imperialists) of the United States it would be well received. Already three months ago the Hearst press, so long anti-British, was rejoicing in Mr. Churchill as having raised their "anti-Bolshevik" hopes.

And here, perhaps, we have one clue to future Tory policy. For if they walk hand-in-hand with the extreme reactionaries within the U.S.A., they may by this means hope to augment their own powers of obstruction, both in Europe and eventually here in Britain. Remember the intrigues with New York bankers when the Labour Government of 1931 was disrupted and destroyed. Remember the play made by the Tory press a month ago with the reported disinclination of prominent American financiers to continue previous Anglo-American policies lest now it would mean "to underwrite Socialism."

The concentration on Europe is also a preparation for similar attacks at home. Indeed, the same day five hours later Churchill spoke of the Labour Party's "dictatorial skin which is in the nature of the party and which we are accustomed to contemplate in a totalitarian State."

To sum up, the new trend in Tory policy, developed in these last four months on the international field, would endanger the maximum unity of the three chief allies and undermine their common decisions at the Crimea and Berlin. It could hinder the development of the new democracies in Europe to the extent that British and American Tories work together to give support to European reactionaries. To avoid contamination with this Tory foreign policy, the labour movement must be on its guard: and even those who hold to "continuity of foreign policy" should realise that the "continuity" was broken abruptly by the Tory ministers themselves.

NOTE TO READERS

There was an exceptionally heavy demand for the August LABOUR MONTHLY. As the ordinary demand far exceeds the possible supply owing to the restrictions made by the Paper Control, this additional demand may have caused many of our regular readers to have missed their copies. Any readers in this position can avoid this in future by taking out a postal subscription for the LABOUR MONTHLY. Rates :—

Home : 7s. for twelve months; 3s. 6d. for six months.

Abroad: 8s. for twelve months; 4s. for six months.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Tripartite Conference of Berlin.

(July 17th to August 2nd, 1945)

SECTION I *of the report tells of the meetings at Cecilienhof, near Potsdam, and concludes: "President Truman, Generalissimo Stalin and Prime Minister Attlee leave this Conference, which has strengthened the ties between the three Governments and extended the scope of their collaboration and understanding, with renewed confidence that their Governments and peoples, together with the other United Nations, will ensure the creation of a just and enduring peace."*

SECTION II *deals with the establishment of the Council of Foreign Ministers of the five principal Powers (with a joint Secretariat in London) to prepare for the peace settlement and to deal with other matters referred to it. The consultations (agreed at Crimea) between the Foreign Secretaries of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., and U.K. are not affected by this; but the European Advisory Commission, its main task discharged, is now to be wound up.*

III. GERMANY

The Allied armies are in occupation of the whole of Germany, and the German people have begun to atone for the terrible crimes committed under the leadership of those whom, in the hour of their success, they openly approved and blindly obeyed.

Agreement has been reached at this Conference on the political and economic principles of a co-ordinated Allied policy towards defeated Germany during the period of Allied control.

The purpose of this agreement is to carry out the Crimea declaration on Germany. German militarism and Nazism will be extirpated and the Allies will take in agreement together, now and in the future, the other measures necessary to assure that Germany never again will threaten her neighbours or the peace of the world.

It is not the intention of the Allies to destroy or enslave the German people. It is the intention of the Allies that the German people be given the opportunity to prepare for the eventual reconstruction of their life on a democratic and peaceful basis. If their own efforts are steadily directed to this end, it will be possible for them in due course to take their place among the free and peaceful peoples of the world. The text of the agreement is as follows:—

The Political and Economic Principles to Govern the Treatment of Germany in the Initial Control Period

A. Political Principles

1. In accordance with the Agreement on Control Machinery in Germany, supreme authority in Germany is exercised on instructions from their respective Governments, by the Commanders-in-Chief of the armed forces of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the French Republic, each in his own zone of occupation, and also jointly, in matters affecting Germany, as a whole, in their capacity as members of the Control Council.

2. So far as is practicable, there shall be uniformity of treatment of the German population throughout Germany.

3. The purposes of the occupation of Germany by which the Control Council shall be guided are:—

(i) The complete disarmament and demilitarisation of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production. To these ends:—

(*a*) All German land, naval and air forces, the S.S., S.A., S.D., and Gestapo, with all their organisations, staffs and institutions, including the General Staff, the Officers' Corps, Reserve Corps, military schools, war veterans' organisations and all other military and quasi-military organisations, together with all clubs and associations which serve to keep alive the military tradition in Germany, shall be completely and finally abolished in such manner as permanently to prevent the revival or reorganisation of German militarism and Nazism;

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(b) All arms, ammunition and implements of war and all specialised facilities for their production shall be held at the disposal of the Allies or destroyed. The maintenance and production of all aircraft and all arms, ammunition and implements of war shall be prevented.

(ii) To convince the German people that they have suffered a total military defeat and that they cannot escape responsibility for what they have brought upon themselves since their own ruthless warfare and the fanatical Nazi resistance have destroyed German economy and made chaos and suffering inevitable.

(ii) To destroy the National Socialist Party and its affiliated and supervised organisations, to dissolve all Nazi institutions, to ensure that they are not revived in any form, and to prevent all Nazi and militarist activity or propaganda.

(iv) To prepare for the eventual reconstruction of German political life on a democratic basis and for eventual peaceful co-operation in international life by Germany.

4. All Nazi laws which provided the basis of the Hitler regime or established discrimination on grounds of race, creed, or political opinion shall be abolished. No such discriminations, whether legal, administrative or otherwise, shall be tolerated.

5. War criminals and those who have participated in planning or carrying out Nazi enterprises involving or resulting in atrocities or war crimes shall be arrested and brought to judgment. Nazi leaders, influential Nazi supporters and high officials of Nazi organisations and institutions and any other persons dangerous to the occupation or its objectives shall be arrested and interned.

6. All members of the Nazi party who have been more than nominal participants in its activities and all other persons hostile to Allied purposes shall be removed from public and semi-public office, and from positions of responsibility in important private undertakings. Such persons shall be replaced by persons who, by their political and moral qualities, are deemed capable of assisting in developing genuine democratic institutions in Germany.

7. German education shall be so controlled as completely to eliminate Nazi and militarist doctrines and to make possible the successful development of democratic ideas.

8. The judicial system will be reorganised in accordance with the principles of democracy, of justice under law, and of equal rights for all citizens without distinction of race, nationality or religion.

9. The administration of affairs in Germany should be directed towards the decentralisation of the political structure and the development of local responsibility.

To this end:

(i) local self-government shall be restored throughout Germany on democratic principles and in particular through elective councils as rapidly as is consistent with military security and the purposes of military occupation;

(ii) all democratic political parties with rights of assembly and of public discussion shall be allowed and encouraged throughout Germany;

(iii) representative and elective principles shall be introduced into regional, provincial and state (Land) administration as rapidly as may be justified by the successful application of these principles in local self-government;

(iv) for the time being no central German government shall be established. Notwithstanding this, however, certain essential central German administrative departments, headed by State Secretaries, shall be established, particularly in the fields of finance, transport, communications, foreign trade and industry. Such departments will act under the direction of the Control Council.

10. Subject to the necessity for maintaining military security, freedom of speech, press and religion shall be permitted, and religious institutions shall be respected. Subject likewise to the maintenance of military security, the formation of free trade unions shall be permitted.

B. Economic Principles

11. In order to eliminate Germany's war potential, the production of arms, ammunition and implements of war, as well as all types of aircraft and sea-going ships, shall be prohibited and prevented. Production of metals, chemicals, machinery and other items that are directly necessary to a war economy shall be rigidly controlled and restricted to Germany's approved post-war peace-time

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needs to meet the objectives stated in Paragraph 15.

Productive capacity not needed for permitted production shall be removed in accordance with the reparations plan recommended by the Allied Commission on reparations and approved by the Governments concerned or if not removed shall be destroyed.

12. At the earliest practicable date, the German economy shall be decentralised for the purpose of eliminating the present excessive concentration of economic power as exemplified in particular by cartels, syndicates, trusts and other monopolistic arrangements.

13. In organising the German economy, primary emphasis shall be given to the development of agriculture and peaceful domestic industries.

14. During the period of occupation Germany shall be treated as a single economic unit. To this end common policies shall be established in regard to:

(*a*) mining and industrial production and allocation;

(*b*) agriculture, forestry and fishing;

(*c*) wages, prices and rationing;

(*d*) import and export programmes for Germany as a whole;

(*e*) currency and banking, central taxation and customs;

(*f*) reparation and removal of industrial war potential;

(*g*) transportation and communications.

In applying these policies account shall be taken, where appropriate, of varying local conditions.

15. Allied controls shall be imposed upon the German economy but only to the extent necessary:

(*a*) to carry out programmes of industrial disarmament and demilitarisation, of reparations, and of approved exports and imports.

(*b*) to assure the production and maintenance of goods and services required to meet the needs of the occupying forces and displaced persons in Germany and essential to maintain in Germany average living standards not exceeding the average of the standards of living of European countries. (European countries means all European countries excluding the United Kingdom and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.)

(c) to ensure in the manner determined by the Control Council the equitable distribution of essential commodities between the several zones so as to produce a balanced economy throughout Germany and reduce the need for imports.

(*d*) to control German industry and all economic and financial international transactions, including exports and imports, with the aim of preventing Germany from developing a war potential and of achieving the other objectives named herein.

(*e*) to control all German public or private scientific bodies, research and experimental institutions, laboratories, etc., connected with economic activities.

16. In the imposition and maintenance of economic controls established by the Control Council, German administrative machinery shall be created and the German authorities shall be required to the fullest extent practicable to proclaim and assume administration of such controls. Thus it should be brought home to the German people that the responsibility for the administration of such controls and any breakdown in these controls will rest with themselves. Any German controls which may run counter to the objectives of occupation will be prohibited.

17. Measures shall be promptly taken:—

(*a*) to effect essential repair of transport;

(*b*) to enlarge coal production;

(*c*) to maximise agricultural output;

(*d*) to effect emergency repair of housing and essential utilities.

18. Appropriate steps shall be taken by the Control Council to exercise control and the power of disposition over German-owned external assets not already under the control of the United Nations which have taken part in the war against Germany.

19. Payment of Reparations should leave enough resources to enable the German people to subsist without external assistance. In working out the economic plan of Germany the necessary means must be provided to pay for imports approved by the Control Council in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany. The proceeds of exports from current production and stocks shall be available in the first place for payment for such imports.

The above clause will not apply to the equipment and products referred to in paragraph 4 (a) and 4 (b) of the Reparations Agreement.

IV. Reparations from Germany

In accordance with the Crimea decision that Germany be compelled to compensate to the greatest possible extent for the loss and suffering that she has caused to the United Nations and for which the German people cannot escape responsibility, the following agreement on reparations was reached:—

1. Reparation claims of the U.S.S.R. shall be met by removals from the zone of Germany occupied by the U.S.S.R. and from appropriate German external assets.

2. The U.S.S.R. undertakes to settle the reparation claims of Poland from its own share of reparations.

3. The reparation claims of the United States, the United Kingdom and other countries entitled to reparations shall be met from the Western Zones and from appropriate German external assets.

4. In addition to the reparations to be taken by the U.S.S.R. from its own zone of occupation, the U.S.S.R. shall receive additionally from the Western Zones:

(*a*) 15 per cent. of such usable and complete industrial capital equipment, in the first place from the metallurgical, chemical and machine manufacturing industries, as is unnecessary for the German peace economy and should be removed from the Western Zones of Germany, in exchange for an equivalent value of food, coal, potash, zinc, timber, clay products, petroleum products and such other commodities as may be agreed upon.

(*b*) 10 per cent. of such industrial capital equipment as is unnecessary for the German peace economy and should be removed from the Western Zones, to be transferred to the Soviet Government on reparations account without payment or exchange of any kind in return.

Removals of equipment as provided in (*a*) and (*b*) above shall be made simultaneously.

5. The amount of equipment to be removed from the Western Zones on account of reparations must be determined within six months from now at the latest.

6. Removals of industrial capital equipment shall begin as soon as possible and shall be completed within two years from the determination specified in paragraph 5. The delivery of products covered by 4 (a) above shall begin as soon as possible and shall be made by the U.S.S.R. in agreed instalments within five years of the date hereof.

The determination of the amount and character of the industrial capital equipment unnecessary for the German peace economy and therefore available for reparation shall be made by the Control Council under policies fixed by the Allied Commission on Reparations, with the participation of France, subject to the final approval of the Zone Commander in the Zone from which the equipment is to be removed.

7. Prior to the fixing of the total amount of equipment subject to removal, advance deliveries shall be made in respect of such equipment as will be determined to be eligible for delivery in accordance with the procedure set forth in the last sentence of paragraph 6.

8. The Soviet Government renounces all claims in respect of reparations to shares of German enterprises which are located in the Western Zones of occupation in Germany as well as to German foreign assets in all countries except those specified in paragraph 9 below.

9. The Governments of the United Kingdom and United States of America renounce their claims in respect of reparations to shares of German enterprises which are located in the Eastern Zone of occupation in Germany, as well as to German foreign assets in Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary, Rumania and Eastern Austria.

10. The Soviet Government makes no claims to gold captured by the Allied troops in Germany.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

V. Disposal of the German Navy and Merchant Marine

The Conference agreed in principle upon arrangements for the use and disposal of the surrendered German fleet and merchant ships. It was decided that the Three Governments would appoint experts to work out together detailed plans to give effect to the agreed principles. A further joint statement will be published simultaneously by the Three Governments in due course.

VI. City of Koenigsberg and the Adjacent Area

The Conference examined a proposal by the Soviet Government that, pending the final determination of territorial questions at the peace settlement, the section of the western frontier of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics which is adjacent to the Baltic Sea should pass from a point on the eastern shore of the Bay of Danzig to the east, north of Braunsberg-Goldap, to the meeting point of the frontiers of Lithuania, the Polish Republic and East Prussia.

The Conference has agreed in principle to the proposal of the Soviet Government concerning the ultimate transfer to the Soviet Union of the city of Koenigsberg and the area adjacent to it as described above, subject to expert examination of the actual frontier.

The President of the United States and the British Prime Minister have declared that they will support the proposal of the Conference at the forthcoming peace settlement.

VII. War Criminals

The Three Governments have taken note of the discussions which have been proceeding in recent weeks in London between British, United States, Soviet and French representatives with a view to reaching agreement on the methods of trial of those major war criminals whose crimes under the Moscow Declaration of October, 1943, have no particular geographical localisation.

The Three Governments reaffirm their intention to bring these criminals to swift and sure justice. They hope that the negotiations in London will result in speedy agreement being reached for this purpose, and they regard it as a matter of great importance that the trial of these major criminals should begin at the earliest possible date. The first list of defendants will be published before September 1, this year.

VIII. Austria

The Conference examined a proposal by the Soviet Government on the extension of the authority of the Austrian Provisional Government to all of Austria.

The Three Governments agreed that they were prepared to examine this question after the entry of the British and American forces into the city of Vienna.

IX. Poland

The Conference considered questions relating to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity and the western boundary of Poland.

A. On the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity they defined their attitude in the following statement:

We have taken note with pleasure of the agreement reached among representative Poles from Poland and abroad which has made possible the formation, in accordance with the decisions reached at the Crimea Conference, of a Polish Provisional Government of National Unity recognised by the Three Powers. The establishment by the British and United States Governments of diplomatic relations with the Polish Provisional Government has resulted in the withdrawal of their recognition from the former Polish Government in London, which no longer exists.

The British and United States Governments have taken measures to protect the interest of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity as the recognised Government of the Polish State in the property belonging to the Polish State

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

located in their territories and under their control, whatever the form of this property may be.

They have further taken measures to prevent alienation to third parties of such property. All proper facilities will be given to the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity for the exercise of the ordinary legal remedies for the recovery of any property belonging to the Polish State which may have been wrongfully alienated.

The Three Powers are anxious to assist the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in facilitating the return to Poland as soon as practicable of all Poles abroad who wish to return to Poland, including members of the Polish Armed Forces and the Merchant Marine. They expect that those Poles who return home shall be accorded personal and property rights on the same basis as all Polish citizens.

The Three Powers note that the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in accordance with the decisions of the Crimea Conference, has agreed to the holding of free and unfettered elections as soon as possible on the basis of universal suffrage and secret ballot in which all democratic and anti-Nazi parties shall have the right to take part and to put forward candidates, and that representatives of the Allied Press shall enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Poland before and during the elections.

B. The following agreement was reached on the western frontier of Poland:

In conformity with the agreement on Poland reached at the Crimea Conference the three Heads of Government have sought the opinion of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity in regard to the accession of territory in the north and west, which Poland should receive.

The President of the National Council of Poland and members of the Polish Provisional Government of National Unity have been received at the Conference and have fully presented their views. The three Heads of Government reaffirm their opinion that the final delimitation of the western frontier of Poland should await the peace conference.

The three Heads of Government agree that pending the final determination of Poland's western frontier, the former German territories east of a line running from the Baltic Sea immediately west of Swinemunde, and thence along the Oder River to the confluence of the western Neisse River and along the western Neisse to the Czechoslovak frontier, including that portion of East Prussia not placed under the administration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in accordance with the understanding reached at this conference and including the area of the former free city of Danzig, shall be under the administration of the Polish State and for such purposes should not be considered as part of the Soviet zone of occupation in Germany.

X. Conclusion of Peace Treaties and Admission to the United Nations Organisation

The Conference agreed upon the following statement of common policy for establishing as soon as possible the conditions of lasting peace after victory in Europe.

The Three Governments consider it desirable that the present anomalous position of Italy, Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary and Rumania should be terminated by the conclusion of Peace Treaties. They trust that the other interested Allied Governments will share these views.

For their part the Three Governments have included the preparation of a Peace Treaty for Italy as the first among the immediate important tasks to be undertaken by the new Council of Foreign Ministers. Italy was the first of the Axis Powers to break with Germany, to whose defeat she has made a material contribution, and has now joined with the Allies in the struggle against Japan.

Italy has freed herself from the fascist regime and is making good progress towards the re-establishment of a democratic Government and institutions. The conclusion of such a Peace Treaty with a recognised and democratic Italian Government will make it possible for the Three Governments to fulfil their desire to support an application from Italy for membership of the United Nations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Three Governments have also charged the Council of Foreign Ministers with the task of preparing Peace Treaties for Bulgaria, Finland, Hungary and Rumania.

The conclusion of Peace Treaties with recognised democratic Governments in these States will also enable the Three Governments to support applications from them for membership of the United Nations. The Three Governments agree to examine each separately in the near future, in the light of the conditions then prevailing, the establishment of diplomatic relations with Finland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary to the extent possible prior to the conclusion of peace treaties with those countries.

The Three Governments have no doubt that in view of the changed conditions resulting from the termination of the war in Europe, representatives of the Allied press will enjoy full freedom to report to the world upon developments in Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary and Finland.

As regards the admission of other States into the United Nations Organisation, Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations declares that:

"1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving States who accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the organisation, are able and willing to carry out those obligations:

"2. The admission of any such State to membership in the United Nations will be effective by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council."

The Three Governments, so far as they are concerned, will support applications for membership from those States which have remained neutral during the war and which fulfil the qualifications set out above.

The Three Governments feel bound, however, to make it clear that they for their part would not favour any application for membership put forward by the present Spanish Government, which, having been founded with the support of the Axis Powers, does not, in view of its origins, its nature, its record and its close association with the aggressor States, possess the qualifications necessary to justify such membership.

XI. Territorial Trusteeship

The Conference examined a proposal by the Soviet Government concerning trusteeship territories as defined in the decision of the Crimea Conference and in the Charter of the United Nations Organisation.

After an exchange of views on this question it was decided that the disposition of any former Italian Colonial territories was one to be decided in connection with the preparation of a peace treaty with Italy and that the question of Italian territory would be considered by the September Council of Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

XII. Revised Allied Control Commission procedure in Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary

The Three Governments took note that the Soviet Representatives on the Allied Control Commissions in Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary, have communicated to their United Kingdom and United States colleagues proposals for improving the work of the Control Commissions, now that hostilities in Europe have ceased.

The Three Governments agreed that the revision of the procedures of the Allied Control Commissions in these countries would now be undertaken, taking into account the interests and responsibilities of the Three Governments which together presented the terms of armistice to the respective countries, and accepting as a basis, the agreed proposals.

XIII. Orderly Transfers of German Populations

The Conference reached the following agreement on the removal of Germans from Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

The Three Governments, having considered the question in all its aspects, recognise that the transfer to Germany of German populations, or elements thereof,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remaining in Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, will have to be undertaken. They agree that any transfers that take place should be effected in an orderly and humane manner.

Since the influx of a large number of Germans into Germany would increase the burden already resting on the occupying authorities, they consider that the Allied Control Council in Germany should in the first instance examine the problem with special regard to the question of the equitable distribution of these Germans among the several zones of occupation.

They are accordingly instructing their respective representatives on the Control Council to report to their Governments as soon as possible the extent to which such persons have already entered Germany from Poland, Czechoslovaka and Hungary, and to submit an estimate of the time and rate at which further transfers could be carried out, having regard to the present situation in Germany.

The Czechoslovak Government, the Polish Provisional Government and the Allied Control Council in Hungary are at the same time being informed of the above, and are being requested meanwhile to suspend further expulsions of the German populations pending the examination by the Governments concerned of the report from their representatives on the Control Council.

XIV. Military Talks

During the Conference there were meetings between the Chiefs of Staff of the Three Governments on military matters of common interest.

APPROVED:

J. V. STALIN. HARRY S. TRUMAN. C. R. ATTLEE.

Berlin, *August* 2, 1945.

Book Reviews

A Marxist looks at the Civil Service

The Civil Service and the People by R. W. Rawlings (Lawrence & Wishart, pp. 162, 7*s*6*d*).

THIS LITTLE book makes history; it is the first large-scale attempt to apply Marxist principles in an analysis of the place of the British Civil Service in modern society and to show how its internal characteristics are explicable only by reference to its social context. Even if, for reasons mentioned below, Mr. Rawlings has by no means written the last word on the subject, at least he has the honour of having written almost the first.

He writes, presumably, both for the civil servant and for the general public. He will hardly satisfy either class of reader, for he assumes too much. Because he himself realises that the Civil Service, as the administrative instrument of the State, is thus the instrument of the social class called for short "monopoly capitalism," he seems to think that by stating this fact he has proved it; but actually a great deal of patient and detailed explanation is necessary before most of his readers will be convinced that his thesis is true. This tendency to use emphatic statement as a substitute for persuasive logic is a serious weakness in a book which breaks important new ground.

Another defect is its discursiveness, which ensues partly from its no doubt enforced brevity. But some of the factual details, such as those relating to the movement for the abolition of section V of the Trades Disputes Act or the purely domestic matters like Whitleyism, might well have been abbreviated so as to allow greater space for an elaboration of the main themes. These themes are of great importance—the growing significance of the Civil Service in social life, the tendency to better understanding (fostered by progressive civil servants themselves) between the Service and the public, the increasing awareness among civil servants of the social value of their work, and the expanding place of science in Government service.

Mr. Rawlings has opened a new window on the Civil Service. Let us hope that both he and other writers will analyse further the reasons why the Service is unpopular and how this can be remedied.

L. W.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Rebirth of France

The Struggle for French Democracy by Cyril Claydon (Lawrence & Wishart, 1945, 138 pp., 5*s*).

FRANCE, with its great tradition of democratic struggle, has long furnished lessons for other countries. Now, when France is finding its way from the depths of fascist degradation to a new level of popular sovereignty and greatness, its problems are of no less vital interest to us and need to be seen in the light of the conditions created by the war and after.

The special merit of this little book is that it gives just the approach necessary for such a survey. It begins rightly and successfully with a straightforward account of the French country and its people, providing the necessary background for understanding French social and political developments.

The author is to be congratulated on the simplicity and freshness of his treatment. It enables him to include a wealth of relevant detail while keeping clearly in view the essential features of the development he is tracing.

Over one-third of the book is devoted to "The Rebirth of France," covering the whole period from the collapse of France in 1940. The growth of the united resistance movement, the epic of liberation and the present gigantic tasks of economic and political revival are clearly and vividly described.

Most of the later part of this chapter is based on material dating from the end of last year so that it is perforce more general in character. The sparseness of the bibliography for this section reveals the lack of literature covering recent developments.

In the light of events the French popular struggle seems now more complicated and to have been less immediately successful than the author describes it in his last pages and there are many statements which would need some correction. Nevertheless, the author successfully conveys the great significance of the new spirit and political awakening inspiring the French people as a whole.

CLEMENS DUTT.

Publications Received

PAMPHLETS

Victory Year, 1945 by William Rust (*Daily Worker*, 2*d*, 10 pp.).

Prefabrication Demarcation and the Shipyard Trades by Finlay Hart (Scottish Committee, Communist Party, 3*d*, 15 pp.).

Social Insurance (L.R.D., 6*d*, 20 pp.).

Vox Pop (Workers Music Association, 6*d*, 10 pp.).

Talking of Music by H. G. Sear (Workers Music Association, 1*s*, 28 pp.).

The Co-operative Movement's First Hundred Years, 1844-1944 by Desmond Flanagan (Pilot Press 1*s*, 48 pp.).

Nurseries After the War (C.P., 2*d*, 12 pp.).

The Shape of a Future World by Minos Darivas (Thos. K. Roushias, 6*d*, 10 pp.).

Trade Unions and Politics (Marx House Educational Leaflet No. 5) (Marx House, 1*d*).

Making Hitler Look Silly. Cartoons and Posters by the Soviet artists Kukrynniksi (*Soviet War News*, 1*s*. 48 pp.).

Red Air Force by Alexander Pokryshkin (Soviet War News, 1*s*, 56 pp.).

Local Government and Civil Liberty by Elizabeth A. Allen (National Council for Civil Liberties, 6*d*, 30 pp.).

Civil Liberty and the Colonies (National Council of Civil Liberties, 9*d*, 30 pp.).

The Scottish Tories by Fred Douglas (Scottish Committee, C.P., 2*s*, 94 pp.).

PENGUINS

Pelican

An Autobiography by R. G. Collingwood (Penguin, 9*d*, 112 pp.).

A Survey of Russian Music by M. D. Calvocoressi (Penguin, 9*d*, 142 pp.).

Penguin New Writing No. 23 (Penguin, 9*d*, 175 pp.).

PENGUIN SPECIAL

A Plan of Economic Development for India (Memorandum) Parts 1 and 2 (Penguin, 9*d*, 105 pp.).

An Outline History of the Australian Communist Party by L. L. Sharkey (Australian C.P., 1*s*, 84 pp.).

Speeches in Parliament: Fred Paterson (Australian C.P., 6*d*, 32 pp.).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LABOUR MONTHLY GUARANTEE FUND

Amount received in August, 1945 : £68 : 9 : 2

ALL THEY COULD SPARE.

"I am sending separately a Money Order which represents some small collections and a personal donation as some small recognition of your role in the July 25th victory. **We realise that your job takes all that we can possibly spare now."**

It certainly does! At the same time it is encouraging to know that some of our readers are fully aware of the urgency of the situation. Even more so when the letter from which the extract above is taken, is written by a reader living not in London, nor even in the British Isles, but in **San Francisco!**..... An American reader makes a special collection from friends to show her appreciation of our efforts in the Election Campaign.

Not that many of our readers here at home do not play their part by sending in to the Fund regularly month after month, and in many cases, year after year (and this has been our mainstay during the past few years), but we need more such collections and guarantees.

During the years of war-time restrictions, the **Labour Monthly**, like every other publication, has had to make dire concessions in the way of quantity, size and paper. With the return to normal conditions we hope to revert to our pre-war standards. More than that—our plans are for a wider and more comprehensive production. **But we can't do it without your help.**

Doubtless we have all studied the Cost of Living figures. They've risen, as we all know. Have you ever considered what this has meant to the **Labour Monthly**? The £100 target set a few years ago is now by no means enough—and we can still only rarely reach that £100.

We want to give you that post-war Labour Monthly.
Will you help us make it possible?

	£	s.	d.
Progressive Airman		5	0
J. Schwartz		2	6
R. Anderson		7	6
P. Andrews	1	0	0
F. Weiner	1	0	0
D.G.10, C.M.F.	2	5	0
H. S. M.		2	6
A. Neuwirth		5	0
Smoke	1	0	0
G. Harrison	2	5	0
H. Hodson		10	0
A. Dawson		3	0
J. Purton	1	0	0
G. Sargent		5	0
S. Hazlett		2	0
Civil Servant		13	0
G. Warrack		10	0
Forces, per D. A. H.	1	0	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
Mr. & Mrs. Humphreys		2	6
G. Robson		5	0
W. M. Tweedale		8	11
J. W. Turner		4	0
T. W. R.	1	0	0
S. Mill		10	0
A. Wall		5	0
J. C. Barton		15	0
D. Goodfellow		2	0
D. Gardner		6	0
E. E. Bardach		4	7
E. J. Stout		5	0
F. Combes		1	0
D. Rees		10	0
Office Worker		2	6
R. B. Sleep		2	6
R. Green		10	0
E. Fischer		1	3
V.A.D.		5	0
W. Lakin-Smith		2	6
R. Anderson		7	6
Director	2	0	0
Learner		2	0
M. Chatterway	1	0	0
E. Dixon			6
J. Pack		3	6
I. Powell		2	6
H. White		3	0
B. Bader		2	0
Two R.A.F. Supporters	1	15	0
L. Hood		10	0
F. Seyd	4	13	0
P. Brinson	5	0	0
Anon, Whitchurch		2	0
A. W. Bertram		10	0
D. Feldman		2	6
S. Herossian		1	0
R. R. R.	1	0	0
N. Macdonald		10	0
Eight of the Boys		10	0
F. E. Stehr		5	0
Penrith D.G.		5	0
R. D. Graham		3	0
Anon, Whitchurch	1	3	0
H. Reiss		3	0
J. Duncan		13	0
P. Coates		3	0
A. Downing			6
K. D. Harding		2	6
J. W. Gibson		10	0
G. Sargent		5	0
F. Pittman		3	0
L. J. Martin		3	0
F. Farrington		10	0
G. E. & M. Philibert		10	0
H. A. B.	10	0	0
L'Humanite		2	0
E. Reckitt	1	0	0
W. Maddison	1	0	0
R. Pearson		2	6
Old Age Pensioner		2	6
F. M. R.		5	0
S. Clegg		10	0
M. D. Davies		3	0
H. Williams	1	0	0
H. A. Percival		3	6
J. Rattray		5	0
Subtenanto		5	0
W. C.		13	0
E. A. Fidler	1	0	0
D. Palmer		10	0
W. G. Harries	1	10	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0
V. S. Dodwell		3	0
R. Hart	1	0	0
J. Creidenberg		5	11
G. Taylor			6
A. & B. Muskett	1	0	0
Socialist Sailor	2	10	0
J. A. Smith		2	6
S. Morrissy		12	0
M. Kirkman		8	0
M. Nicholas		2	0
A. G. Neville		7	0

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3rd impression now ready

A History of ANGLO-SOVIET RELATIONS

W. P. & Z. COATES

18s.

LAWRENCE & WISHART AND PILOT PRESS

APPLICATION FOR POSTAL SUBSCRIPTION

NAME..... ADDRESS.....
(*Please use Block Capitals*)

.....

.....

I am a regular reader of LABOUR MONTHLY and I wish to become a postal subscriber. I enclose $\frac{7/\text{- (Home)}}{8/\text{- (Abroad)}}$ to cover 12 months' subscription beginning with the

.....issue.
(*Strike out the words which do not apply*).

Signed.....

Date.....

DO IT NOW!

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Evans, Spencer & Co. Ltd., London, E.C.4.

PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED